
STAFF ACCOUNTABILITY SUBGROUP MEETING

Wednesday, July 12, 2017 - 13:00 to 14:00

[This meeting is now being recorded]

>> Thank you. Thank you all for joining the meeting. This is Aubrey Dura. This is the Staff Accountability Meeting, 12 July, 2017, 13:00 UTC.

So the first thing I'll do is go through the agenda. It's the fairly standard agenda. After the agenda, I'll do the attendance talk, the SOI check. But the substantive issue of the week is basically a debrief on the first Plenary meeting we had. I'll indicate while I was doing my prep yesterday, I wanted to pull out the excerpts from the transcript of that, but I couldn't find it, so at this point we'll be working on our own memories and notes, et cetera.

And then go on to next steps.

Not much to say on the document update. We have Rev 1.1. There's the supplement to the report which is no longer a working document. There's the response to staff questions that we really do need to get back to, but it's not on today's agenda. And then there's the schedule update with the perennial needs updating, to the extent that we can get more precise. And so we can talk about that a little.

And then just here's an updated schedule, which we can talk about some. And then any other business.

Note: The following is the output resulting from the RTT (Real-Time Transcription also known as CART) of a teleconference call and/or session conducted into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

So does anybody have any comments, questions, changes, additions so this agenda? Okay, then let's go with it.

Attendance will be taken from the Adobe Connect. I was just about to ask who G was, but G went away. Do we have anybody who is only on the phone? Okay, I don't hear anyone, so I'll assume. I don't know if we had any apologies. I only sent out the agenda a few hours ago, but the meeting was announced in plenty of time.

Okay, SOI reminders, anybody whose material conditions have changed to the extent that it would affect the work in this group, please speak up. No one? Okay, great.

If such does occur, please remember to update your SOI and mention it at our next meeting.

Okay, so going to the issue of the week, it's the debrief on the first Plenary meeting. Wondering if Brenda, you or Bernie probably, can bring up the Rev 1.1 that I just sent back. And then if it's unsynched people can use it to reference [audio echoing]. Okay. So, yes, so somebody's got a speaker on. Okay, I guess not anymore.

Okay. So this is less organized than I hoped it would be because I did plan to go through the issues from the transcript. Since I was talking most of the time, I did very little note taking. I certainly saw two very large issues that stood out that

I think we need to talk about at some point was the whole discussion that I'm flippantly terming "so where's the dirt?" Basically challenging the approach we took of gathering the information, generalizing it in terms of issues, and then working on a generalized notion. But we did have a fair amount of pushback on that, so we need to decide whether we want to go back and get specific about issues or whether we, perhaps, want to develop a further explanation of why that was the right thing to do, with perhaps the addition of, and, you know, basically looking at the recommendations. Are they things that are so erroneous that you need to actually see the dirt? Or are they good ideas anyhow? Or some such approach.

I think I'll stop on that and see if anybody's got anything to say. Do people think we should go back and get down and dirty? Or should we keep with the approach that we've taken? Really? Nobody's got a view on it?

Yes, Klaus, please.

>> KLAUS: Yes, good morning. Yes, to start, I think on the one side, yes, people want to hear the dirt, they want to be specific. On the other hand, I think when we are getting into specific cases, a whole report will open itself up to being misinterpreted and actually being subject to how you see a specific case, but not about staff accountability in general. There might be one middle way, but I'm not even sure myself if it's a good middle way, is to identify a very specific problem

areas like staff assuming community roles, or whoever, and highlighting specific areas, but I wouldn't go further than that. Thank you.

>> AVRI: Okay, thank you. Any other comments? Yes, Alan?

>> ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I happened to sit next to Teresa at some event at the ICANN event in Joburg and we had a discussion on this, on the fact we don't have specific examples. And her response was, how is a Manager supposed to respond if we don't have any examples, if we don't have very specific things? And I made it clear certainly from my -- in my opinion, we're not going to get a lot more from people who are there. As it turned out, she happened to mention in another part of the conversation that someone on her staff was leaving and I said, fine, in that case, I'll give you some examples of that person, but I'm not going to endanger my relationship with them. You know, if you are a good Manager, you may figure out a way to address the issue. Good by my, Alan's definition, to address the issue. Or you may simply go to person and say, you know, hey, John, what is this all about? Why is Alan complaining about you? And certainly from my perspective that's not the right way to handle it, yet I know there are people in ICANN who would do exactly that.

And we're just not going to give specifics, but if there are complaints, then they're going to have to figure out how to address them, even though we don't have the specific dirt in each case. I don't know how we do that and I don't know

how we convince them there are issues even though we cannot cite examples.

But I don't see any other way forward. Thank you.

>> AVRI: Thank you, Alan. One thing I thought about -- we'll get right to you, George -- one thing I thought while you were speaking is that the recommendations we are offering are recommendations to prevent such situations and to make it possible for Managers to learn of these issues in a safe, non-threatening way going forward. And going forward is really the issue, not disciplining anyone specific. Anyhow, yes, George, please. George, you may be muted, I do not hear you.

>> GEORGE: Sorry, I think I'm on now.

>> AVRI: Yes, I hear you now.

>> GEORGE: Thank you. Let me go back to the meeting in South Africa. The Board's -- the [indiscernible] of the Board was that there's -- it's -- let me start over. I have no doubt that there are issues where staff is behaving in ways that are not necessarily consistent with helping the community. We all know of some occasions like that. And I don't know if there are many or there are few. My guess is there aren't very many, but you have found some evidence in a variety of places. I wouldn't call it dirt, first of all. Second, it's a condition to be recognized and to be ameliorated in some way. And without some understanding of the nature, extent, et cetera, of the actual specifics, it's very difficult to understand

whether the recommendations solve a real problem or not. And so that's why the Board has, in effect, suggested the way to deal with this is maybe it's a two stage process, it's not necessarily an open process. And that may give you some problems. The suggestion was, look, let us create a safe space to look at this evidence and then we can understand whether you've conceptualized the problem correctly, whether we agree with it or not. And assuming we do, whether the recommendations are the best recommendations to solve the problem.

So I don't think that this is possible within the realm of your charter and if it is, that would be great. And the question of what constitutes a safe space for the exploration of the issues, well, I suppose the Board or the staff or a combination could suggest it and maybe you'd like to suggest it. So it's a departure from the normal way of doing business and I don't know if that's possible or not. But that's what is missing that gives the Board some assurance that the recommendations are solving a problem which has been properly conceptualized and that exists.

Thanks.

>> AVRI: Thank you. If I might -- oh, sorry, you wanted to say something else, George?

>> GEORGE: Yes, I wanted to say something else. Normally I make these in my own personal capacity, but here I'm reporting a Board opinion.

>> AVRI: Yes, we understand that. Thank you for pointing that out. I think you still

have your microphone on. Thank you.

One thing, and perhaps we don't speak of it enough, in some sense, though we may have gone beyond it, I think what we've recommended is, indeed, a way to sort of do what you are talking about. We're trying to create that safe space going forward. I think there's less interest in the past, other than as an example, and even if your statement, you know, I think we see that most people can admit that there have been occurrences of one sort or another and I think that the recommendations, perhaps they need to explain better, perhaps they need to be more pointed and written differently are, indeed, trying to create that safe space, but trying to create it in a way to prevent future problems as opposed to digging deeper into the past problems. I think anybody reading our record, reading the e-mail, reading the documents that they may or may not find there, and I think they will find some, will see that there were some really documented cases. We don't want to memorialize them in documents, but there certainly were specifics spoken of in our record, in our discussions.

So I sort of understand the Board's position, but I'm wondering whether they're not recognizing these recommendations as, indeed, in a sense what they are asking for is how to create that safe space for communication going forward and hopefully doing it in a way that is not erroneous in any way that one can look at the recommendation and say, oh, my, that is such a difficult thing or that is such

an erroneous thing that, you know, without really, really specific, severe incident we could never consider it. And if there is a recommendation like that, I'd like to know.

So in some ways I'm wondering whether it's possible to sort of stipulate to the fact that there are issues and people have reported them and they are in our record and that we're looking for ways to create the safe space that you all suggest going forward. Just a thought.

Klaus -- Alan, I see your hand

>> ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much, Alan Greenberg. This is a conversation George and I have had in private. Based on a discussion with a fair number of Board members, I think the Board has a very difficult job understanding the difference that they are -- how they are treated by staff compared to how staff might react to virtually anybody else. It really is quite startling when you see it at times. So I tend to agree with you, Avri, I -- setting up this space is going to be difficult and we need to figure out some way of doing it, but the fact that there are people complaining, even if their complaints are not really the main problem, there are issues that need to be addressed and we need to figure out a way going forward. And I don't think we're going to change the overall atmosphere or tone in ICANN very quickly. And we're certainly not going to change it prior to trying to address the issues. So somehow we need to span

the difference between magically fixing the problems and the kind of discussion that -- or kind of space George is talking about. There really is an issue and it's going to have to be taken on faith at some level that it is, in order for us to try to address it. I'm not sure if that's clear, but I hope it is. Thank you.

>> AVRI: Thank you, Alan. Klaus, please.

>> KLAUS: One of the ideas I had was to maybe create some kind of checklist of issues. Management could go through this step and basically say this seems to be of concern, are we doing that? Do we have practices which are going against that? So if we could give them a kind of checklist or issue list that basically staff could test itself on, might be one helpful way forward. Thank you.

>> AVRI: Thank you for that suggestion. Is that something, just to be clear, is that something that you think we should be doing now, before finishing the thing? Is it something that you think should be part of our recommendation for going forward? I wasn't clear on the timing for that. And by the way, this is Avri speaking and we are supposed to keep listing our names and I keep forgetting.

Klaus, can you clarify that and then George I'll come to you.

>> KLAUS: This is Klaus. I sent a report and I feel that report is not executable enough to have an impact. If we could add a list to this report, it would make it more executable and make it more of having some follow-up and not just hanging there.

>> AVRI: Okay, Klaus -- I mean, George, please.

>> GEORGE: Thank you. A couple of things. First of all, Alan and I have had this discussion in private a number of times. We -- at least I as a member of the Board, understand the degree of deference that is given to me. Frankly, I don't like it and I tell people to treat me as a colleague and let's talk about the issues of the problem on an equal basis rather than you deferring to me as a Board member who presumably has so much power over events, which I don't. So I would say that's an independent issue that I would like the staff to understand and to treat me with less deference.

But I think it's independent of the real problem and that is the Board is not averse to understanding this problem. The Board is not -- and these are my perceptions now, but I think I do speak for the Board. We don't want to avoid issues that are real. We want to help community and ICANN generally to achieve its objectives, but we don't understand -- there's no substantiation given in the report, or very little, I can't say none, given to the fact that this is a problem because I don't think we understood -- "we" the Board, understand the problem. And maybe the staff doesn't understand the problem. And maybe the Board thinks that the community doesn't conceptualize the problem correctly. I think we need a multi-step process here. And here I'm speaking for myself, but my sense would be to recommend that a problem exists and to create the safe space.

And that is, I think, the heart of dealing with the problem. If we can create a safe space where these things are talked about, understood, without damaging reputation or relationships to the extent possible, then I think we will come to an appreciation of what needs to be done to fix it. But not -- if the Board doesn't understand the problem and the staff may or may not understand the problem, it's not going to get fixed. We need the understanding to come first. Thank you.

>> AVRI: Thank you, George. Okay, so I'm actually taking from this that we have a communication problem because I think this group was a safe space. Staff was invited and to a certain extent participated. Unfortunately Patrick isn't here today for this meeting and he has been standing in and such. But it also then occurs to me that perhaps we do need to go into the discussions we've had and do a sterilized abstraction of the issues that were brought up in this safe space that was created specifically for that purpose which was used to a limited extent by staff. So I'm beginning to understand as much of a communication problem is terms of not trusting us that it's in our records and the Board saying, we don't trust you, so please be a little more specific about it in the plan so that we can go forward with it.

We also don't explain in the report enough that this group was created as a safe space for staff and community to discuss these things in general with the CEO's permission and promise of no repercussion, et cetera. So all that was in

place and yet we got very limited use of the safe space this time around.

So I'm beginning to see it as a communication and perhaps we can solve it in that way.

Yes, Cheryl.

>> Thanks, Cheryl [indiscernible] for the record.

First, thanks for what you just said, I think that's a good analysis and certainly that as well as your earlier suggestion was moving forward in terms of looking at how specifically some of what has been written and see if it can be made bleedingly obvious, why certain recommendations are as they are.

But I guess I want to just have on the record my continued difficulty in understanding why we're having to prove the cause in such great detail as opposed to what you have, I think very clearly articulated, Avri, today and on other occasions, that this is a, we've made some recommendations, we've looked at how we can build in, and not quite future proof, but future plan, to quote George, ameliorate things that arise in the future. I'm not sure why we are getting tripped up in the ability to believe in is an issue at all as opposed to the fact that the issues are provable with verifiable data as opposed to these are even potential issues. You know, they may not even be potential issues, but if they are just potential issues, why can't we get on with the job of building a better model? I just needed to say that because I'm finding this inability to believe a little bit

difficult to swallow. It may be just a communication exercise, Avri. It may be other things. It may be from where hypothesis and where the different component is coming from, I don't know, but I'm not sure why we're getting stuck back at that point rather than just getting on with the job. Thanks.

>> AVRI: Okay, thanks. Just to be clear, I think we're getting back at that point because we've got a Board statement saying we've got to deal with this issue is the reason I think we're doing it.

Alan, please.

>> ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, two things. I must admit, I have to question, and maybe the answer is implicit of why the Board is looking at it at this level. I guess we have a hands-on Board who are partially made up of technicians that want to fix problems, but I wouldn't think that would be a Board discussion. But notwithstanding, I don't think I agree this is just a communication issue. Saying this group is set up as a safe space, does not change the fact there are transcripts and recordings and if I report a specific set of instances, which I could right now, it would go back immediately to the person and how that person and their management would react, I don't know. Maybe they would take it well and say, oops, we made a mistake, we're not going to do that again. Or maybe not. And I just don't think that's going to happen even if we designate this, put a label on it saying, this is a safe space. I just don't think the world works that way.

Thank you.

>> AVRI: Okay, thank you. George. And then I would like to move on to another topic, but George, please.

>> GEORGE: I want to repeat. I think the Board has substantial sympathy for any problems that come out of this. This is not an “us versus them.” We are not trying to escape or avoid problems. If anything, I think Alan is right, we are bunch of technicians who want to solve problems, and the clearer the problem, the better we like it because the more likely we are to achieve a solution. I agree with Alan with regard to the safety of this space. A public space is not a safe space for these discussions. Period.

Second, I think your notion of sterilized abstraction is what you have already in the paper and the issue is that the Board -- looking at it, the Board cannot obtain from those sterilized abstractions a good nature of the issue, at least to its satisfaction. It is a communication problem, but it's more than that.

And to Cheryl's point about, why do we have to prove our position? Yeah, we don't really. You don't, but if you want the Board to understand it and be sympathetic to the solutions, I think there's more work to be done. And I don't think it can be done in a safe -- in a public space.

Let's see, think I that covered all my questions. Oh, yes, have you received communication from the Board regarding a formal answer to -- I think it's a formal

answer, I don't know exactly the state of it -- to your draft report? Because I know that one was being drafted when I left Johannesburg. Has that been received?

>> AVRI: Excuse me? Are you saying we were supposed to get a communication from the Board?

>> GEORGE: You should be getting one.

>> AVRI: Okay, I have not seen one yet.

>> GEORGE: That's eminent or at least I hope it's eminent. I know the outlines were drafted after leaving Johannesburg and after a meeting like this, everyone sort of relaxes for a while, so it's possible you have not gotten one. And that will be the official Board position on the report. Sorry it has not come out yet.

>> AVRI: Okay, fantastic. Okay, then what I recommend we do is we take this discussion and basically table it until we get the Board's communication. And we get back to it when we've got that to work off of. And then we can decide at that point how we want to handle it, whether we want to make an appeal that we're going to take longer even than we thought, as we thought we were coming to a closing point, or not. But we can certainly discuss that once we get the communication.

If it's okay with people, I'd like to move on to another topic. We have gone about half way through this hour. And I very much understand the not wanting to get started again. I had a very strong urge to cancel this meeting as opposed to

prepping for it and having it and I love the week is ICANN free after an ICANN meeting. So I very much understand the difficulty in having sent that already. So thank you.

I had one other problem listed and then I'd like to see, you know, if other people have others that came out. As I said, I haven't been able to go through the transcript, so I pretty much got what I remember. And the next one I remember was the panel. Many aspects of the panel seem to be problematic, from those that saw it as Bureaucratic, to those that saw it as somehow unnecessary and saw various other issues. I need a transcript to remember the details.

So I wonder if anybody would like to speak about the panel and what they heard, what they understood and perhaps what they think about where we are on it. And if people need a reminder, the panel is under "Recommendations." It's Recommendation 3 on page four.

Nobody has thoughts on panels?

>> ALAN GREENBERG: It's Alan. I am not at my desk and I can't flip to that page. Can you give us a summary? I can't remember what panel we are talking about.

>> AVRI: I'll read it out. [Indiscernible] composed of the Complaint Officers, a representative chosen by the empowered community and a Board member. The panel will review concerns or issues raised by the community [indiscernible] staff or Board that at least two panel members determine and require further effort.

While this panel would work transparently, it will at its discretion be able to treat issue that is require it as confidential.

I parsed that last phrase a little badly. It will at its discretion be able to treat issues that require it as confidential.

Anybody have any comments on that? In some sense this does offer the confidentiality that was being referred.

Yes, Klaus.

>> ALAN GREENBERG: And this is Alan. If I could get in when Klaus is done.

>> AVRI: Klaus and then Alan.

>> KLAUS: We need to know who is on the panel, what will they do and what will be done? And we will have an endless discussion of the way people are chosen, who is on it and so on. What you heard and what I heard, if nothing else, that's what is to be expected, but that doesn't mean that we can recommend it nevertheless.

>> AVRI: Okay, thanks. And perhaps we do understood to be more specific. There is only one that needs to be chosen -- well, two. The Board needs to, by its own method, choose one, and the empowered community, who is still figuring -- yeah, the empowered community who is still figuring out how to do things would need to figure out how to do that.

Yes, Alan?

>> ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Alan Greenberg speaking.

I'm dubious this would work. Personally, just the difficulty of getting four people in those positions to find a time where they could talk to each other on short notice is clearly almost impossible, I would think. But I would be willing to give it a try and see if it works or not. But I have my doubts on how well it would work. But I'm certainly willing to try. Thank you.

>> AVRI: Okay, thank you.

>> ALAN GREENBERG: I agree with some of the problems Klaus mentioned, but I don't think they are as onerous as actually making it [indiscernible].

>> AVRI: I'll mention that Herb -- I apologize, I have not been keeping up with the chat, but I'll go to it. And there were some valuable chats that were on our previous conversation that will be on the record and I'm sorry I didn't get to them while we were still on the topic.

Herb says, no audio, it kills my connection, but I am open -- I guess that means no speech -- but I am open to being involved in the discussion of this if it moves forward.

It sounds like there are two or three of you that are willing to take a further look at this and see if it can't be specified in a way that perhaps can work or perhaps we come up with a reason to remove it, but I think it would be good to at least give it a chance and see what happens with it.

Yes, Cheryl?

>> Thanks, Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record, again.

I have no intention of it being killed or removed, I think it's written perfectly clearly and I think it should be exactly used. I think how bad that happened in the reading that we did is very likely to be the people who [indiscernible] regardless or have outlined the usually propensity for our community to [indiscernible] that needs to be challenged, talked about, and expanded to the possible member to have everybody have their representation. One of the things I like about this is its leanness. You know, a Board member, a person from the community, and the people whose job it is to deal with most of this rubbish. And I mean rubbish in the nicest possible way, not in a garbage way.

>> [Laughter].

>> But, you know, I think we just note the disconcerting concern, I should say, and just move on because it's lean and it's worth having a go at. Thanks.

>> AVRI: Thank you. Perhaps the mistake was calling it a panel because everybody thinks they already know what a panel is and we should have called something like a colloquium. And I'm only being slightly facetious. By the way, this is Avri speaking.

So I think it's still worth probably taking a look at it and seeing if the wording can't be enhanced or tightened up a little to try and avoid some of those. And

perhaps we do want to give it a different name. Panel is often -- you know, there are so many words at ICANN that take on a special meaning. We create things like cross community working groups and then define them so tightly we can't use them. We do things like that a lot. So the word "panel" may, indeed, be overloaded with meaning and it may be time for a neologism. I don't know.

If there's nobody else that wants to speak on that one -- by the way, definitely not a Council of Elders or go with the IETF route or go a non-sexist way and call it the Council of Grey Hairs. I don't think that would be a good way.

But the document is open for comments and suggested edits, so I suggest on any of these things, any of you that has a suggestion for how to do it, is more than welcome, is more than invited, is entreated to go into the file and do something. You'll notice that there's no meeting next week because I'm running back and forth between Mycen and Prague, teaching in Mycen and doing the IETF in Prague and I know I can neither prepare for a meeting nor do one, so basically did not schedule one. So perhaps during this upcoming week, those of you that have ideas on how to improve what is before us can.

I see no hands, so those were the two that were the top of my mind. I feel like I'm forgetting something else that's important at the moment. I wanted to open it up and ask those of you on the call whether you had picked up specific problem areas that we should -- we've got 20 minutes left -- 19 minutes left on this call,

although I do want to get to the end stuff, but at least to get other things mentioned. Anybody have one? I don't see any hands. I continue with my anxiety that I'm forgetting something, but once I do have the transcript to read and once we all have the transcript to read, we can pull out of it. Once the transcript is there, I'll do an excerpt of it and put it on Drive, in the same directory that I'm using for all of this stuff and let you all know so that you can all reference it easily as opposed to having to search for it.

So is there anything else on the debrief? Let me go back to the agenda, let me see what I had on the agenda. There was a second topic on the agenda and I want to make sure I didn't forget it. Oh, next steps. I think we talked about the next steps a little. I did put some action items there. I'm not sure if they're good. If you look at the Drive document, I said, add discussion of the issues, not very specific about it, add explanation of staff accountability as a safe place, but, of course, we've gotten the feedback on that one already, that because of its transparency, it can only be a semi safe space, no repercussions that could retain are perhaps not enough to make it a safe space. I tend to be a transparency maximalist and look for ways to create safety and maintain transparency, but perhaps George is right, and Alan, is that there's no guarantee at ICANN can overcome the reproductions that sometimes ensue from transparency. So that may, indeed, be an issue, but we're not the Transparency Group, so we won't delve into that.

Anybody else have an issue or should I move on in the agenda? Okay, I'll move on in the agenda.

So as I said with the document update, we'll continue revising this. We'll talk through all the issues. We'll go through the Board communication when it arrives and discuss it and decide, you know, how we want to deal with it and, you know, move on. Pick up any other issues that show up in the transcript, discuss them, fix, and decide when we're ready for the second reading.

The supplement to the report, when we've got other things to add, if we build more tables, if we do more issue discussion, if we do whatever, those can be added in their gory detail there as part of the backup to the work.

Yes, Bernie?

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you, Avri. Just picking up on your comment of having a second reading of the document [dogs barking]. Sorry, the dogs are excited. I'm unclear we actually [dogs barking] confirmed that the Plenary accepted it and it passed first reading. I can go back and double check. That definitely is something that I noted.

>> AVRI: Okay. Thank you. I had trouble hearing you. You had another interlocutor there overpowering you, but you said whether they accepted it as a first reading? I thought a first reading happened, you got comments, you made fixes, you came back for a second reading. If the second reading didn't accept it,

you came back for a third. I didn't realize that it had to be accepted as having been acceptable in its first reading. Perhaps I misunderstand how the first and second readings are working. I see your hand is still up.

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: Yes. Indeed, Avri, in the past, I've been taking the notes, as you know, for the plenaries, is that when the document is presented for first reading, and I've actually written this up somewhere, I'll have to dig it up, there are really three outcomes. Either it's accepted, it's accepted with comments, or it's not accepted. And I, for whatever reason, I don't remember us actually asking if it was accepted. Now this may have simply been an oversight. But what I will do, and by the way, I don't know why the transcript is not up and I'm following up on that right now. I'll go back through it, but there is clearly a question, at least in my mind, if the document was accepted for first reading. Thank you.

>> AVRI: Okay, thanks. And if we have to do another first reading because we have once again defined terms in such a way that they are hard to use, that's cool. We'll just do another first reading when we're ready.

Okay, okay, then going back to the document update, there was the -- oh, the other thing in the action items was Klaus's suggestions of a checklist of things that Managers can look at in appraisal. And Klaus, I don't know if you and others want to take a first stab at such a work list could be, that would be useful so the next time we talk about it so that we can actually look at an example and see how

it fits. I'd recommend putting it in a separate document for now and then we can, you know, fold it into once we've had a discussion and people decide it works. Is that okay with you, Klaus? Yes, Klaus, I see your hand.

>> KLAUS: Avri, I will try, but I will not promise.

>> AVRI: Okay.

>> KLAUS: If I can fit it in, I will do it, if not [indiscernible].

>> AVRI: Okay, thanks. I'll try to start an empty Drive document as a temptation for people and we'll see where we go. Okay. Excuse me.

Okay, the next thing is the response to the staff questions. We've got to get back to that. It has a lot of discussion about safe spaces and who we're afraid of and should they be afraid of us issues in it. So this may be an opportune time while we're discussing George and the Board's issues to go and take a look at that document again since there's some indication that the Board's issues and the staff questions may not be unrelated. So I would look like us in the next meeting to actually put that document also on the schedule. And I'd like to ask people to go to that document over the next week, take a look at it, see what they think of where it is.

Okay, anything? We've got 10-11 minutes left.

The next thing is the schedule update. It needs updating. Obviously we don't know whether we've had a first reading or not. I thought we had. Hopefully we did.

I understand that a second reading that is accepted with comments or rejected requires a third reading, but as I say, I may not understand our rules.

The rest of the schedule basically hinges on that and us getting to our subsequent readings, whether that was a zero reading or first reading and such. So I think the updating will need wait until, A, we see whether we had a first reading or not. And, B, whether, you know, how long it's going to take us to get to our second reading. And we can talk about that at the next meeting.

I went through and -- any issues, questions on that? Okay.

Moving on, the updated meeting schedule. I've got two blocks that I'm unavailable. The first one is, as I said, I travel in a few hours and then I'm basically out of it for ten days and while I'll try to do stuff on the documents and I'll be following the lists, I wouldn't have time to prepare for a meeting or I wouldn't know where to fit it into the schedule I've got. So our next meeting will be the 26th of July. And then a week later, 2 August and then 9 August. So three meetings, basically on a weekly basis at that point.

Then I have an APC retreat going back to South Africa and going for the retreat to a communications lien-type of area. So my ability to communicate during that period will be limited. I don't know what level access I'll have for that meeting, so I figured it would be unwise to schedule during that period.

And then basically starting up again, I'm not sure, I'd have to go back and see

why the gap in September. Hopefully by then we will be in good shape and we'll be moving forward. If we need to schedule additional meetings we can, but those are the one that is have been scheduled as of this point. I have maintained the rotation. The slight skews in rotation are due to the availability of spots that I found when I went to the schedule.

Yes, Bernie, I see your hand.

>> BERNARD TURCOTTE: Thank you. Just to note, I sent out a schedule for the Plenaries to June next year and we're moving to monthly Plenary calls so we're approximate not having a call in July and our next Plenary call usually will be scheduled for the last Wednesday of the month, unless there's an ICANN meeting in the middle of the month. So just for planning purposes, we'll be keeping the requirement that any documents to be presented to the Plenary be presented -- be sent in seven days before. Thank you.

>> AVRI: Thank you very much. And we will definitely take that into account as we figure out the next time we are talking about schedule what date to aim at for our next attempt at a Plenary reading.

Any comments on schedule and all of that? Okay.

Any other business? Anybody got any other business? I see nobody. I hear nobody. And so with that, I thank you. I thank those doing the scribing. I think Bernie. I thank Brenda. And I thank all of you for attending, three, six, eight

people. That's actually very good for a first week back to doing ICANN stuff after a meeting and lots of travel. So be well, all. And I'll talk to you in a couple weeks.

Thank you very much. The call is adjourned.

>> Thanks, Avri. Bye, everyone.